

SHERMAN MINTON CORRIDOR PROJECT
RFQ Q&A MATRIX #1
ISSUED DECEMBER 6, 2019

IFA / INDOT No.	Sec/Page	Questions/Comment	Response
1.	General	Will there be any meetings or a published list of planholders issued for the RFQ that is currently out for bid? My company is located in the project vicinity and is interested in contacting teams regarding our interest in subcontracting opportunities.	The shortlisted firms will be announced around February 7, 2020.
2.	Part A, Section 7.3(f)/Page A-28	Refers to prequalification categories described in 2.1.3(c). It appears that the prequalification categories listed on Page A-9 as “Additional INDOT....Work Types” are not part of Section 2.1.3(c). Please confirm that meeting these additional prequalification categories is not mandatory for the purposes of the SOQ and that it is acceptable to add additional team members later if needed to meet any prequalification categories that may be required when the RFP is issued.	Correct. The prequalification categories listed under “Additional INDOT Contractor Work Types” and “Additional INDOT Consultant Work Types” will be addressed in the RFP and team members may be identified later for those categories. The items listed above those paragraphs in <u>clause (c)</u> , however, must be addressed in the SOQ.
3.	Part A, Section 2.8/Page A-15	Describes design build contractor warranties. Please describe anticipated warranties, especially as it pertains to design work.	The extent and length of Project-related warranties, including any warranties applicable to design work, remains under development and will be addressed in the RFP.
4.	Part A, Section 7.3(i)/Page A-29	7.3(i) requires the proposer to have done a comparable project, defined as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. completed within the last two years 2. an interstate project 3. with federal-aid 4. including complex bridge rehabilitation / paint 5. in the United States 	See revised RFQ <u>Part A, Section 7.3(i)</u> in Addendum #1.

		<p>6. \$100M minimum contract value</p> <p>The definition of “comparable projects” in Section 7.3(i) is highly specific and will preclude most, if not all, potential bidders from qualifying. We propose that the IFA amend the requirement to uncouple Federal-aid from the other requirements, and extend the completion timeframe to five (5) years from SOQ Due Date.</p>	
5.	Part B	<p>Part B of the RFQ currently requires specific information regarding the Lead Painting Firm, essentially forcing each Lead Contractor to team with a painter during this very early phase of the procurement. RFQ Part A, Section 8.4.2 further limits each painter (by being a Major Participant) to involvement on only one team. We do not believe that it’s in the best interest of the IFA or INDOT to force each team to pick a preferred painter during the SOQ phase. While we recognize that painting is a major scope item, and the Lead Painter will be a Major Participant, we request consideration be given to removing the requirement to name the Lead Painter from the SOQ. This will allow each short-listed Proposer to work with multiple painting contractors once the RFP is released, develop competition in pricing, and provide the more economical and technically feasible approach in our proposals. The Lead Painter and their qualifications could then be submitted with the Technical Proposal for review.</p>	See revised RFQ <u>Part A, Section 8.4.2</u> in Addendum #1.
6.	General	<p>In light of the major holidays between issuance of the RFQ and the SOQ Due Date, will the IFA consider extending the SOQ Due Date by two weeks?</p>	No change